

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RAHSHAUN CHAMBERS,

Plaintiff,

v.

NOVO NORDISK INC.,

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:24-cv-01173

(MUNLEY, J.)

(SAPORITO, C.M.J.)

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

This civil action commenced with the lodging of a *pro se* complaint by the plaintiff, Rahshaun Chambers, on July 10, 2024, with the clerk of another federal district court. Doc. 1. The complaint was not accompanied by payment of the requisite \$405 filing and administrative fees or a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. On July 16, 2024, the case was transferred to this court. Doc. 3; Doc. 4. On July 17, 2024, we ordered that, within fourteen days, the plaintiff either (a) submit a properly completed application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or (b) pay the requisite \$405 filing and administrative fees. Doc. 5.

Now, well more than fourteen days later, the plaintiff has neither submitted a properly completed application to proceed *in forma pauperis* nor paid the required \$405 filing and administrative fees to the Clerk of

Court. Accordingly, we recommend that this action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to pay the requisite filing and administrative fees and that the Clerk be directed to administratively close this case. *See Lindsey v. Roman*, 408 Fed. App'x 530, 532–33 (3d Cir. 2010) (per curiam); *Parker v. Harrisburg City*, Civil No. 1:17-CV-00653, 2017 WL 3015880, at \*2 (M.D. Pa. June 7, 2017), *report and recommendation adopted by* 2017 WL 3008583 (M.D. Pa. July 14, 2017).

Dated: August 14, 2024,

*s/Joseph F. Saporito, Jr.*

JOSEPH F. SAPORITO, JR.

Chief United States Magistrate Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RAHSHAUN CHAMBERS,

Plaintiff,

v.

NOVO NORDISK INC.,

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:24-cv-01173

(MUNLEY, J.)

(SAPORITO, C.M.J.)

**NOTICE**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the undersigned has entered the foregoing Report and Recommendation dated August 14, 2024. Any party may obtain a review of the Report and Recommendation pursuant to Local Rule 72.3, which provides:

Any party may object to a magistrate judge's proposed findings, recommendations or report addressing a motion or matter described in 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) or making a recommendation for the disposition of a prisoner case or a habeas corpus petition within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy thereof. Such party shall file with the clerk of court, and serve on the magistrate judge and all parties, written objections which shall specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objection is made and the basis for such objections. The briefing requirements set forth in Local Rule 72.2 shall apply. A judge shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which

objection is made and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge. The judge, however, need conduct a new hearing only in his or her discretion or where required by law, and may consider the record developed before the magistrate judge, making his or her own determination on the basis of that record. The judge may also receive further evidence, recall witnesses or recommit the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

Failure to file timely objections to the foregoing Report and Recommendation may constitute a waiver of any appellate rights.

Dated: August 14, 2024

*s/Joseph F. Saporito, Jr.*  
JOSEPH F. SAPORITO, JR.  
Chief United States Magistrate Judge